

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed December 15, 2003, Applicants request continued examination, amend their application, and request reconsideration.

In this Amendment claim 12 is amended to correct minor errors and to state that the address electrodes, which are on the rear substrate, are parallel to the auxiliary partition walls. Further, at least some of those auxiliary partition walls are disposed directly opposite an address electrode. This description is supported in the patent application and most easily understood with respect to the embodiment of Figures 1-3.

In those figures, the address electrodes are elements 26 and the auxiliary walls or wall portions are walls 32, 33, and 34. The address electrodes 26 are illustrated in the lower left side of Figure 1 and in Figure 3. Figure 2 is a plan view of the arrangement of the auxiliary walls 32, 33, and 34 in the embodiment. Those auxiliary walls, as described in claim 12, are transverse to the main partition walls. The main partition walls are shown as horizontal in Figures 2 and 3. The address electrodes 26, as shown in Figure 3, are vertical.

The address electrodes are parallel to each other and parallel to the auxiliary partition walls. Each partition wall is opposite at least one of the address electrodes. Of course, Figures 2 and 3 are only partial views of a much larger array in which a typical address electrode 26 would pass beneath, i.e., directly opposite, multiple auxiliary partition walls. At least parts of each of the address electrodes are not directly opposite any auxiliary partition wall because the auxiliary partition walls, unlike the main partition walls, are not continuous. With respect to the numbered address electrode 26 in Figure 3, it can be seen that that address electrode is disposed directly opposite and beneath the auxiliary partition wall 34 in the upper half of the figure. That address electrode is not directly opposite any auxiliary partition wall in the lower half of the figure.

All claims stand rejected as unpatentable over Yoshida et al. (U.S. Patent 6,489,722, hereinafter Yoshida) in view of Sakai et al. (U.S. Patent 6,498,430, hereinafter Sakai). This rejection is respectfully traversed with respect to the claims now presented.

Turning first to Yoshida, the address electrodes in the embodiments shown there are identified as A. The auxiliary partition walls, at least the partition walls that are generally parallel to the address electrodes, are numbered 291 and 29c in various embodiments described by Yoshida. It is apparent that none of the address electrodes A, referring to Figures 1 and 4-11 of Yoshida, is ever disposed directly opposite any of the auxiliary partition walls or the partition walls that are parallel to the address electrodes.

In Sakai, the address electrodes are elements 3 shown in each of the figures. Those address electrodes 3 are parallel to walls that separate different cells. However, the address electrodes 3 are never directly opposite those walls but are always directly opposite the deepest part of the cells defined by the partition walls. Therefore, Sakai does not describe any arrangement in which at least some of the partition walls are parallel to address electrodes and some address electrodes are disposed directly underneath, i.e., opposite, a partition wall.

Since neither Yoshida nor Sakai includes an element of amended claim 12, an independent claim, *prima facie* obviousness cannot be established with respect to any of claims 12 and 14-20 based upon any combination of Yoshida and Sakai. For that reason, the rejection cannot be properly maintained.


Newly added claims 21-28 are derived from claims 12 and 14-20. These added claims are clearly supported by the application as filed. In the structure defined by claim 21, the auxiliary walls of claim 12 are defined as auxiliary wall portions that are transverse to and connected to respective pairs of the main partition walls. As shown, for example, in the embodiment of Figures 1-3 of the patent application, the auxiliary wall portions are arranged in a staggered pattern. As explained in claim 21, the staggering means that at least one pair of the partition wall portions on opposite sides of a main partition wall, and contacting that main partition wall, are not aligned with each other. In other words, while the auxiliary partition wall portions are parallel to each other, at least one pair of those auxiliary partition wall portions that are joined through one of the main partition walls are not aligned or continuous with each other, but are offset from each other along a direction parallel to the main partition wall contacted by those auxiliary partitions wall portions.

None of the newly submitted claims 20-28 can be anticipated by nor obvious in view of any combination of Yoshida and Sakai. All of the patterns of partition walls that could be characterized as main partition walls and auxiliary partition walls in Yoshida have continuous walls in a crisscross pattern. This is not the staggered pattern as described in claims 20-28. All of the views of Sakai are from the side and therefore Sakai cannot contribute any relevant information from which to attempt to modify Yoshida to produce a structure like that claimed in claims 20-28.

In re Appln. of KIM et al.
Application No. 10/046,832

Upon reconsideration, the rejection should be withdrawn and all of claims 12 and 14-28 allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Jeffrey A. Wyand, Registration No. 29,458
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER
700 Thirteenth Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, DC 20005-3960
(202) 737-6770 (telephone)
(202) 737-6776 (facsimile)

Date: March 15, 2004
JAW:ves